

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0108 f/k/a 035451-0129 (3631.Palm)

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application. No claim amendments are made.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate status identifier for each.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,535) in view of Smethers (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,304). In the Office Action, Smethers has been combined with the previously-applied Narayanaswami reference, stating “Smethers teaches an analogous application launcher for a two-way mobile communications device, which teaches the concept of having a launching e-mail application in a portable device (see 120, fig. 2; col. 4, lines 19 – 32; col. 7, lines 8 – 40).”

A study of these passages of Smethers makes clear that item 120 is an envelope symbol which directly launches an e-mail application. However, Claim 10 recites both an e-mail application AND a launching application. Neither Smethers nor Narayanaswami disclose, alone or in combination, an e-mail application AND a launching application, wherein the launching application “modif[ies] parameters of the handheld computer . . . so that the e-mail application is able to use a wireless connection,” as claimed. Smethers provides no disclosure that its e-mail application is unable to use a wireless connection. In fact, Smethers teaches that handheld applications “are typically scaled-down version of like applications provided on personal computers.” (Smethers, col. 1 lines 23-25). Thus, there would be no need in Smethers for a

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0108 f/k/a 035451-0129 (3631.Palm)

launching application which “modif[ies] parameters of the handheld computer . . . so that the e-mail application is able to use a wireless connection,” as claimed in Claim 10.

Furthermore, Narayanaswami and Smethers fail in the following respects to teach the other elements of Claim 10:

1. Neither reference teaches “an email application not configured for use over a wireless connection on a handheld computer.” Narayanaswami, like Smethers, teaches an icon on a Wrist Watch device for directly launching an e-mail application. (Narayanaswami, col. 7 lines 23-25 and col. 4 line 66-col. 5 line 1 (“The touch sensitive screen enables the direct launching of applications by physical user entry of a graffiti ‘squiggle’ . . .”). A second unit, the “smart pervasive dock” can intercept a huge e-mail message destined for the Wrist Watch device and format the data so as to transmit a summary, e.g., just the e-mail subject line. The Wrist Watch operates an email application, but because the Wrist Watch receives the summary data from the smart pervasive dock, this email application is clearly configured for use over a wireless connection. The smart pervasive dock does not operate an e-mail application at all, much less an e-mail application not configured for use over a wireless connection.

2. The Office Action appears to indicate that the application that changes parameters is on the smart pervasive dock in Narayanaswami. However, Claim 10 recites that the handheld computer has both the launching application that changes parameters AND the e-mail application. Claim 10 states that the e-mail application is on the handheld computer, and that the launching application is also on the handheld computer and modifies parameters of the handheld computer. Neither reference teaches these limitations.

3. Further, the Office Action indicates that Narayanaswami discloses “modifying parameters of the handheld computer, by the launching application, so that the e-mail application is able to use a wireless connection.” However, the smart pervasive dock of Narayanaswami does not modify *parameters* of the handheld; it changes e-mail *data* to a form suitable for the handheld.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0108 f/k/a 035451-0129 (3631.Palm)

Turning to Claim 15, this Claim recites: “providing an application not configured to run on the handheld computer.” As discussed above, Smethers provides no disclosure that its applications are unable run on a handheld computer. Quite the contrary, Smethers teaches that handheld applications “are typically scaled-down version of like applications provided on personal computers.” (Smethers, col. 1 lines 23-25). Accordingly, Smethers only teaches running scaled-down, handheld-sized applications on its system.

Furthermore, Narayanaswami and Smethers fail in the following respects to teach the other elements of Claim 15:

1. Neither Narayanaswami nor Smethers teaches the claimed applications: one application “not configured to run on the handheld computer” and one “launching application” which “modif[ies] parameters of the handheld computer . . . so that the application is able to run on the handheld computer.” The applications of both Narayanaswami and Smethers are already able to be run on their respective devices and, therefore, these references fail to teach even the need for the claimed launching application.

Narayanaswami teaches a transcoder which enables data to be converted from an original format to a format which may be more suitable for a smaller device, such as the wristwatch device described. Narayanaswami does not describe the enabling use of an *application* on an unintended platform; rather Narayanaswami teaches enabling the use of *data* on a device which it was not intended for.

2. Further, the Office Action indicates that Narayanaswami discloses “modifying parameters of the handheld computer, by the launching application, so that the e-mail application is able to use a wireless connection.” However, the smart pervasive dock of Narayanaswami does not modify parameters of the handheld; it changes e-mail *data* to a form suitable for the handheld.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0108 f/k/a 035451-0129 (3631.Palm)

For all of the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 10 and 15 is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 11-14 and 16-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami in view of Smethers. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims 10 and 15. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0108 f/k/a 035451-0129 (3631.Palm)

Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned attorney or agent at the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 6-14-06

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5571
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

By 

Steven C. Becker
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,308